

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/852,372 05/10/2001 Dale E. Gulick 2000.038300/TT3756 5417 23720 EXAMINER 7590 08/25/2005 WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C. POLTORAK, PIOTR 10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100 PAPER NUMBER HOUSTON, TX 77042 ART UNIT 2134

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/852,372	GULICK ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Peter Poltorak	2134		

THIS PAGE IS BLANK

Co	ntinu	ation	Sheet	(PTOL-303)	
v	11111114	alivii	JIICEL	(

Application No.

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 25 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the
following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling
the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected:
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Hadfiled et al. teach a processor is configured to operate in an operating mode, wherein the operating mode is one of a plurality of operating modes including a secure operating mode and secure assets (e.g. files) that can only be accessed in the
secure mode (after a user is validated). Hadfiled et al. teach that each user that accesses any Windows NT Server-based
resources first must be validated by the system, and the user is required to enter a valid password before any interactive
Windows session is allowed (pg. 45, User Accounts in a Windows NT Environment). It is inherent that user logon to the Windows NT system to work on files and as a result applicant's argument that the examiner provides no record support that "files" may be secure assets is not understood. In regard to applicant's argument that Handfield fails to teach or suggest a
mailbox RAM that includes an inbox for storing input data for the one or more secured assets and an outbox for storing output
data from the one or more secured assets the examiner points applicant to § 25 of the previous (Final) Office Action.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 2

GREGORY MORSE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TCHNOLOGY CENTER 2100